



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/931,776 | 08/16/2001 | Kenneth Kay Smith | 10010736-1 | 3658 |

7590 06/29/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LAMARRE, GUY J

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2133

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,776

Applicant(s)

SMITH, KENNETH KAY

Examiner

Guy J. Lamarre, P.E.

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 14 and 16-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 14 and 16-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 29 March 2004 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

FINAL OFFICE ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicants' Amendment of 29 March 2004.
- 1.1 **Claims 12 and 15 are cancelled; Claims 23-29 are added. Claims 1-2, 9 and 13 are amended. Claims 1-11, 13-14 and 16-29 remain pending.**
- 1.2 The prior art rejections of record to the Claims are maintained in response to Applicants' Amendment.
- 1.3 The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and objections of record are withdrawn in response to Applicants' Amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants' arguments of 29 March 2004 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

REMARKS

3. In response to **Claims 1-11, 13-14 and 16-22**, Applicants, on pages 12-19 allege that the prior art of record does not teach "modules for technology type/application determination or storage device memory test or error tracking, or recording and analysis, or age/use tracking."

Examiner disagrees and notes that such modules perform the same functionality as the techniques/interfaces disclosed by the prior art of record, e.g., at col. 4 line 3 et seq. Module, interface, controller are functionally equivalent.

Claim Objections

4. **Claim 24** shall end in a period.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5.2 Claim(s) 1, 2, 23-29 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal).

As per claims 1, 23, 25-27

Agarwal substantially teaches of a payload and of redundancy (error correction code), see lines 30-40 column 6, applicable (lines 21 et seq. - column 1) to all types of transfer/transmission formats and related dynamic mapping/length-adjusting means (lines 3 et seq.- column 18); means to adjust frame of variable payload/redundancy (lines 5 et seq. - column 18 and Figs. 1b: blocks 115&140, Fig. 4: frame assembler, Fig. 5, Figs. 6a-c) wherein real time variable sizes of payloads and ECC are accommodated for data transfer. Agarwal discloses adaptive coding schemes to improve throughput over a wide range of noisy atmospheric conditions by adaptively controlling ECC at col. 3 line 59 et seq. via dynamic frame length adjustment based on channel/media fading conditions at col. 4 line 34 et seq.

Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the data being in a data structure or of a divider between the payload and the redundancy capable of being moved to produce two different ratios of payload to redundancy data. Nonetheless, Agarwal does teach of the data frame being a fixed n bytes long, see line 30 of column 6 with a payload that has a variable length which depends on the size of the forward error correction code, see lines 33-37 of column 6.

Nonetheless, data storage and data communication use similar techniques to ensure the error free communication (read/writes) of codewords. When reading the claim without the divider, one skilled in the art sees that there exists a payload and a redundancy that can be in one of two configurations in which each configuration has a different ratio of payload to redundancy. When read in this light, it is clear that Agarwal teaches of the limitations of this claim. Specifically, in lines 33-37 of column 6, Agarwal teaches of the data frame being a fixed n bytes long, see line 30 of column 6 with a payload that has a variable length which depends on the size of the forward error correction code. By having a variable length payload that depends on the size of the fec code, it is clear that Agarwal is teaching of plural configurations in which the ratio of payload to redundancy is different.

As per claims 2, 24, 26,29

Agarwal teaches of the redundancy containing a first error correction code (when a divider is in a first location) and containing a second error correction code (when the divider is in a second location), see lines 35-50 of column 7 where the forward error correction code is varied.

5.3 Claim(s) 3-5, 7 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal).

As per claim 3,

Agarwal substantially teaches of associating an initial error correcting code with a redundancy; see lines 25-38 of column 8. Specifically Agarwal teaches of setting the error correction code to its maximum value until synchronization is achieved. Agarwal is essentially using the worst-case scenario to set up the initial error correcting code. Agarwal further teaches of replacing (adjusted) the initial error correcting code with an updated one, see lines 35-50 of column 7 where Agarwal teaches of reducing or increasing the error correcting code length depending on channel conditions.

While Agarwal does not explicitly teach of this occurring within a data storage device, Agarwal does teach of the method occurring in data transmission. As is known in the art, data storage and data communication use similar techniques to ensure the error free communication (read/writes) of codewords.

As per claim 4,

When reading the claim without the divider, one skilled in the art sees that there exists a payload and a redundancy wherein the size of the payload and redundancy can be changed in response to the updating of the error correcting code. When interpreted this way, it is clear that Agarwal teaches the limitations of the claim. In lines 35-50 of column 7, Agarwal teaches of

Art Unit: 2133

reducing or increasing the length of the error correction code and therefore increasing or reducing the size of the payload in response to channel conditions.

As per claim 5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reorganize the address space shared by the payload and the redundancy to provide space required by the updated error correcting code. One of ordinary skill in the art would want to reorganize the address space so as to increase/decrease the amount of error correcting code used to protect the data payload. Obviously, one of ordinary skill would want the address space reorganized so as to be able to tell the difference between the payload and redundant data (i.e. have the beginning of the redundancy addressed correctly so as to not point at payload data and have the end of the payload data addressed correctly so as to not point at the redundancy). Only with the correct addressing of payload and redundancy can one of ordinary skill use the redundancy correctly so as to be able to correctly determine if the data has any errors.

As per claim 7.

Agarwal further teaches of tracking the errors made to determine if the initial error correction code is sufficient, see lines 35-50 of column 7, specifically where Agarwal teaches of varying the amount of error correction in accordance with the quality of the communication link. Agarwal is essentially changing the strength of the error correction code by tracking the errors and making the error correction stronger (i.e. more redundancy) if the conditions are poor (and therefore causing more errors), and making it weaker (i.e. less redundancy) if the conditions are ideal.

5.4 Claim(s) 6, 8 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal) in view of admitted prior art 'Specifications' (hereinafter specs).

As per claim 6.

Agarwal substantially teaches, as above in claim 3, of associating an initial error correcting code with a redundancy, see lines 25-38 of column 8. Specifically Agarwal teaches of setting the error correction code to its maximum value until synchronization is achieved. Agarwal is essentially using the worst-case scenario to set up the initial error correcting code. Agarwal further teaches of replacing (adjusted) the initial error correcting code with an updated one, see lines 35-50 of column 7 where Agarwal teaches of reducing or increasing the error correcting code length depending on channel conditions.

Agarwal does not teach of using a memory test on data storage to determine if the initial error correction code is sufficient. Nonetheless, Agarwal does teach of adjusting the error correction code in accordance to channel conditions, see lines 35-50 of column 7.

Specs teaches of using the fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24+ of page 1. As is known in the art, memory tests are frequently done on memory to determine the number of errors that a memory contains.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Agarwal to include the use of the fundamental error rate (and subsequently a memory test) as taught by Specs. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion provided by Specs that the fundamental error rate of a data storage media is the rate at which errors are found within the media. With the adaptive error correcting code of Agarwal implemented within a data storage device (memory), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a memory test to determine the conditions of the memory (similar to determining the conditions of the transmission channel). With Specs stating that the fundamental error rate is used to determine the resources devoted to redundancy, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a memory test to determine the number of errors present on a memory device.

As per claim 8.

Specs further teaches of using the media age and number or reads/writes as further examples of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. As stated above in claim 6 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use. Further, Specs teaches that for some storage devices, the fundamental error rate increases over time or after a certain number of writes and reads, see lines 8-10 of page 2.

5.5 Claim(s) 9,11 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal).

As per claim 9.

Agarwal substantially teaches of a payload and of redundancy (error correction code), see lines 30-40 column 6. Agarwal further teaches of altering (varying) the amount of error correction code used; see lines 35-50 of column 7.

Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the data being in a storage device or specifically of a ratio being defined as the payload to (payload + redundancy). Nonetheless, Agarwal does teach of the data frame being a fixed n bytes long, see line 30 of column 6 with a payload that has a variable length which depends on the size of the forward error correction code, see lines 33-37 of column 6.

While Agarwal does not teach of the data being within a storage device, and instead in a transmission system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to implement the system of Agarwal in a storage device. Both data communication and data storage attempt to successfully transmit/store data by using error correcting/detecting techniques. As such, one skilled in the art would further know that the techniques used by one

Art Unit: 2133

(i.e. data communication) are analogous to those used by the other (data storage) to help produce error free data.

Further, one skilled in the art would know that error correcting codes are often referred to as a specific rate (ratio) code, i.e. $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{3}{4}$, etc... where the first number is data and the second being total of (data + check). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to define the types of redundancies with a ratio of payload to (payload + redundancy). With this, for one skilled in the art to change the amount of redundancy used, it is clear that one would have to change the ratio (rate).

Specs further teaches of using the media age and number of reads/writes as further examples of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. As stated above in claim 10 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use. Further, Specs teaches that for some storage devices, the fundamental error rate increases over time or after a certain number of writes and reads, see lines 8-10 of page 2.

As per claim 11,

Agarwal further teaches of tracking the errors made to determine if the initial error correction code is sufficient, see lines 35-50 of column 7, specifically where Agarwal teaches of varying the amount of error correction in accordance with the quality of the communication link. Agarwal is essentially changing the strength of the error correction code by tracking the errors and making the error correction stronger (i.e. more redundancy) if the conditions are poor, and making it weaker (i.e. less redundancy) if the conditions are ideal.

5.6 Claim(s) 10, is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal) in view of admitted prior art 'Specifications' (hereinafter specs).

As per claim 10,

Agarwal substantially teaches, as above in claim 9, of a payload and of redundancy (error correction code), see lines 30-40 column 6. Agarwal further teaches of altering (varying) the amount of error correction code used; see lines 35-50 of column 7.

Agarwal does not teach of using a memory test on data storage to determine if the initial error correction code is sufficient. Nonetheless, Agarwal does teach of adjusting the error correction code in accordance to channel conditions, see lines 35-50 of column 7.

Specs teaches of using the fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24-26 of page 1. As is known in the art, memory tests are frequently done on memory to determine the number of errors that a memory contains.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Agarwal to include the use of the fundamental error rate (and subsequently a memory test) as taught by Specs. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion provided by Specs that the fundamental error rate of a data storage media is the rate at which errors are found within the media. With the adaptive error correcting code of Agarwal implemented within a data storage device (memory), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a memory test to determine the conditions of the memory (similar to determining the conditions of the transmission channel). With Specs stating that the fundamental error rate is used to determine the resources devoted to redundancy, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a memory test to determine the number of errors present on a memory device.

As per claim 12,

Specs further teaches of using the media age and number of reads/writes as further examples of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5

of page 2. As stated above in claim 10 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use. Further, Specs teaches that for some storage devices, the fundamental error rate increases over time or after a certain number of writes and reads, see lines 8-10 of page 2.

5.7 Claim(s) 13,14,18 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal)

As per claim 13,

Agarwal substantially teaches of updating the initial error correcting code to replace the initial error correcting code in response to a changed error rate (i.e. change in channel condition/quality leading to more or less errors), see lines 35-50 of column 7 and lines 28-38 of column 8. Agarwal further teaches of an ECC library containing at least two ECCs that may be selected as the updated error correcting code, see lines 25-60 of column 10 where Figure 3, a table with bit error rates and the related code length are shown, is described as a table that indexes a bit error rate to a error correcting code length.

Agarwal does teach of adjusting the error correction code in accordance to channel conditions or of using a technology type determination or of reporting the findings to allow an update of error correction codes, see lines 35-50 of column 7. Specs suggests/teaches of using the fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24-26 of page 1. Further, Specs suggests/teaches that technology type as an example of factors that help determine the fundamental error rate, see line 27 of page 1 – line 1 of page 2.

Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the method as being implemented within hardware devices such as ECC assignment modules or ECC libraries. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the

Art Unit: 2133

method in a variety of hardware devices. As is known in the art, one skilled in the art would easily be able to implement a method in hardware once the method is found/determined.

As per claim 14,

Agarwal further teaches of using an initial error correcting code in response to an initial error rate (i.e. the assumption that to use the maximum error correcting code until sync is achieved), see lines 25-38 of column 8.

Again, Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the method as being implemented within hardware devices such as ECC assignment modules or ECC libraries. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method in a variety of hardware devices. As is known in the art, one skilled in the art would easily be able to implement a method in hardware once the method is found/determined.

As per claim 18,

Agarwal further teaches of tracking the errors made to and reporting the error information to allow the size/strength of the code be changed, see lines 35-50 of column 7, specifically where Agarwal teaches of varying the amount of error correction in accordance with the quality of the communication link. Agarwal is essentially changing the strength of the error correction code by tracking the errors and making the error correction stronger (i.e. more redundancy) if the conditions are poor, and making it weaker (i.e. less redundancy) if the conditions are ideal.

Again, Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the method as being implemented within hardware devices such as an error-tracking module. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method in a variety of hardware devices. As is known in the art, one skilled in the art would easily be able to implement a method in hardware once the method is found/determined.

Art Unit: 2133

5.8 Claim(s) 16, 17, 19 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal) in view of admitted prior art 'Specifications' (hereinafter specs).

As per claim 16,

Agarwal substantially teaches, as taught above in claim 13, of updating the initial error correcting code to replace the initial error correcting code in response to a changed error rate (i.e. change in channel condition/quality leading to more or less errors), see lines 35-50 of column 7 and lines 28-38 of column 8. Agarwal further teaches of an ECC library containing at least two ECCs that may be selected as the updated error correcting code, see lines 25-60 of column 10 where Figure 3, a table with bit error rates and the related code length are shown, is described as a table that indexes a bit error rate to a error correcting code length. Agarwal further teaches of using an initial error correcting code in response to an initial error rate (i.e. the assumption that to use the maximum error correcting code until sync is achieved), see lines 25-38 of column 8.

Agarwal does not teach of using a technology type determination or of reporting the findings to allow an update of error correction codes. Nonetheless, Agarwal does teach of adjusting the error correction code in accordance to channel conditions, see lines 35-50 of column 7.

Specs teaches of using the fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24-26 of page 1. Further, Specs teaches that technology type as an example of factors that help determine the fundamental error rate, see line 27 of page 1 – line 1 of page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Agarwal to include the use of the fundamental error rate as taught by Specs. Further, Specs teaches of the various factors that can influence the fundamental error rate, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. This modification would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2133

because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion provided by Specs that technology type (as well as other factors see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2) are used to help determine the fundamental error rate. With the adaptive error correcting code of Agarwal implemented within a data storage device (memory), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use any and all of the dependant factors to determine the fundamental error rate. By using these factors, one skilled in the art would be able to make an accurate estimation of the fundamental error rate, enabling him/her to be able to allocate an appropriate amount of redundancy.

Further once the method of Agarwal is implemented within hardware, it would have been obvious to send the results to a device that can interpret the results and make appropriate adjustments to the error correcting code, if necessary.

Specs also teaches of using the fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24-26 of page 1. As is known in the art, memory tests are frequently done on memory to determine the number of errors that a memory contains. Clearly, since the fundamental error rate is the rate at which errors occur, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use memory tests to help determine the number (and rate) of errors on the storage device. After completing a memory test, one skilled in the art would be able to make a more accurate estimation of the fundamental error rate, enabling him/her to be able to allocate an appropriate amount of redundancy.

Again, Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the method as being implemented within hardware devices such as a memory test module. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method in a variety of hardware devices. As is known in the art, one skilled in the art would easily be able to implement a method in hardware once the method is found/determined.

As per claim 17,

Specs further teaches of using the application type (technology type, which the Examiner is interpreting as expected technology, and hence use, that the memory will have) as a further example of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. As stated above in claim 16 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use, see lines 24-26 of page 1.

Further once the method of Agarwal is implemented within hardware, it would have been obvious to send the information about application determination to an updater to make appropriate adjustments to the error correcting code.

As per claim 19,

Specs further teaches of using the media age and number of reads/writes as further examples of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. As stated above in claim 16 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use, see lines 24-26 of page 1. Further, Specs teaches that for some storage devices, the fundamental error rate increases over time or after a certain number of writes and reads, see lines 8-10 of page 2.

Further once the method of Agarwal is implemented within hardware, it would have been obvious to send the information about age and use to an updater to make appropriate adjustments to the error correcting code.

5.9 Claim(s) 20 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal) in view of admitted prior art ‘Specifications’ (hereinafter specs).

As per claim 20,

Agarwal substantially teaches of an ECC library containing at least two ECCs that may be selected as the updated error correcting code, see lines 25-60 of column 10 where Figure 3, a

table with bit error rates and the related code length are shown, is described as a table that indexes a bit error rate to a error correcting code length. Agarwal further teaches of using an initial error correcting code in response to an initial error rate (i.e. the assumption that to use the maximum error correcting code until sync is achieved), see lines 25-38 of column 8. Agarwal substantially teaches of updating the initial error correcting code to replace the initial error correcting code in response to a changed error rate (i.e. change in channel condition/quality leading to more or less errors), see lines 35-50 of column 7 and lines 28-38 of column 8. Agarwal further teaches of tracking the errors made to and reporting the error information to allow the size/strength of the code be changed, see lines 35-50 of column 7, specifically where Agarwal teaches of varying the amount of error correction in accordance with the quality of the communication link. Agarwal is essentially changing the strength of the error correction code by tracking the errors and making the error correction stronger (i.e. more redundancy) if the conditions are poor, and making it weaker (i.e. less redundancy) if the conditions are ideal.

Agarwal does not explicitly teach of using technology type determination, application type determination, a memory test, age and use tracking, or updated application tracking to help determine if an updated error correcting code is needed.

Specs teaches of using the fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24-26 of page 1. Further, Specs teaches that technology type as an example of factors that help determine the fundamental error rate, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. Specs further teaches of using the application type (technology type, which the Examiner is interpreting as expected technology, and hence use, that the memory will have) as a further example of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. As stated above in claim 16 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use. Specs further teaches of using the

fundamental error rate to determine the quantity of resources devoted to the redundancy, see lines 24-26 of page 1. As is known in the art, memory tests are frequently done on memory to determine the number of errors that a memory contains. Clearly, since the fundamental error rate is the rate at which errors occur, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use memory tests to help determine the number (and rate) of errors on the storage device. After completing a memory test, one skilled in the art would be able to make a more accurate estimation of the fundamental error rate, enabling him/her to be able to allocate an appropriate amount of redundancy. Specs further teaches of using the media age and number of reads/writes as further examples of things that help determine the fundamental error rates, see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2. As stated above in claim 16 and in Specs, the fundamental error rate is used to help determine the amount of redundancy to use. Further, Specs teaches that for some storage devices, the fundamental error rate increases over time or after a certain number of writes and reads, see lines 8-10 of page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Agarwal to include the use of the fundamental error rate as taught by Specs. Specifically, Specs teaches of the various factors that can influence the fundamental error rate (technology type, media age, number of writes/reads, etc...). This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion provided by Specs that technology type (as well as other factors see line 27 of page 1 – line 5 of page 2) are used to help determine the fundamental error rate. With the adaptive error correcting code of Agarwal implemented within a data storage device (memory), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use any and all of the dependant factors to determine the fundamental error rate. By using these factors, one skilled in

Art Unit: 2133

the art would be able to make an accurate estimation of the fundamental error rate, enabling him/her to be able to allocate an appropriate amount of redundancy.

Further, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to continue tracking the application of the media to determine if the error correction code being used is sufficient. By initially selecting a level of error correction based on the expected application, it is obvious that the application can have an impact on the amount of error correction needed. Therefore, one skilled in the art would be motivated to continue monitoring the application so as to be able change the level of error correction being used. One skilled in the art would see this as being comparable to monitoring the condition of a channel, as taught by Agarwal, and changing the level of error correction depending on the state of the channel.

Further once the method of Agarwal is implemented within hardware, it would have been obvious to send the results to a device that can interpret the results and make appropriate adjustments to the error correcting code, if necessary.

5.10 Claim(s) 21-22 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,477,669 (hereinafter Agarwal).

As per claim 21,

Agarwal substantially teaches of associating an initial error correcting code with a redundancy; see lines 25-38 of column 8. Specifically Agarwal teaches of setting the error correction code to its maximum value until synchronization is achieved. Agarwal is essentially using the worst-case scenario to set up the initial error correcting code. Agarwal further teaches of updating the initial error correcting code to replace the initial error correcting code in response to a changed error rate (i.e. change in channel condition/quality leading to more or less errors), see lines 35-50 of column 7 and lines 28-38 of column 8.

When reading the claim without the divider, one skilled in the art sees that there exists a payload and a redundancy wherein the size of the payload and redundancy can be changed in response to the updating of the error correcting code. When interpreted this way, it is clear that Agarwal teaches the limitations of the claim. In lines 35-50 of column 7, Agarwal teaches of reducing or increasing the length of the error correction code and therefore increasing or reducing the size of the payload in response to channel conditions.

Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the method as being implemented within/on a computer-readable medium capable of being executed. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method on a computer-readable medium capable of being executed. As is known in the art, one skilled in the art would easily be able to implement a method in/on a computer-readable medium once the method is found/determined.

As per claim 22,

Agarwal teaches of monitoring (tracking) the errors (and error rate, see lines 45-55 of column 8) made to determine if the initial error correction code is sufficient, see lines 35-50 of column 7, specifically where Agarwal teaches of varying the amount of error correction in accordance with the quality of the communication link. Agarwal is essentially changing the strength of the error correction code by tracking the errors and making the error correction stronger (i.e. more redundancy) if the conditions are poor, and making it weaker (i.e. less redundancy) if the conditions are ideal. Agarwal further teaches of altering (varying) the amount of error correction code used; see lines 35-50 of column 7. Agarwal further teaches of providing a level of redundancy (i.e. error correcting cod size/length) appropriate to the measured error rate; see lines 5-10 of column 10.

Agarwal does not explicitly teach of the method as being implemented within/on a computer-readable medium capable of being executed. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method on a computer-readable medium capable of being executed. As is known in the art, one skilled in the art would easily be able to implement a method in/on a computer-readable medium once the method is found/determined.

5.1 To the extent that the response to the applicant's arguments may have mentioned new portions of the prior art references which were not used in the prior office action, this does not constitute a new ground of rejection. It is clear that the prior art reference is of record and has been considered entirely by applicant. See *In re Boyer*, 363 F.2d 455, 458 n.2, 150 USPQ 441, 444, n.2 (CCPA 1966) and *In re Bush*, 296 F.2d 491, 496, 131 USPQ 263, 267 (CCPA 1961).

The mere fact that additional portions of the same reference may have been mentioned or relied upon does not constitute new ground of rejection. *In re Meinhardt*, 392, F.2d 273, 280, 157 USPQ 270, 275 (CCPA 1968).

Conclusion

6.0 THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Art Unit: 2133

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.1 Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guy J. Lamarre, P.E., whose telephone number is (703) 305-0755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert De Cady, can be reached on (703) 305-9595.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may also be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Guy J. Lamarre, P.E.
Primary Examiner
6/26/04
